

DIVISION II

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS  
NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION  
SAM BIRD, Judge

CACR05-682

JUNE 28, 2006

ANGELA D. WATSON  
APPELLANT

APPEAL FROM THE MISSISSIPPI  
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, OSCEOLA  
DISTRICT,  
[NO. CR02-192]

V.

HON. VICTOR HILL,  
CIRCUIT JUDGE

STATE OF ARKANSAS  
APPELLEE

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED

On May 19, 2003, appellant Angela D. Watson pled guilty to delivery of a controlled substance, cocaine, and was sentenced to sixty months' probation. The State subsequently filed a petition to revoke Watson's probation, alleging that she had violated multiple conditions of her probation. The trial court found that the State had proven a violation of the conditions by a preponderance of the evidence and sentenced her to forty-eight months' imprisonment.

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and Rule 4-3(j) of the Rules of the Arkansas Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, Watson's counsel has filed a motion to be relieved on the grounds that the appeal of this case, a revocation proceeding, is without merit. The motion was accompanied by a brief discussing four matters in the record that

## DIVISION II

might arguably support an appeal, together with a statement as to why counsel considers these matters as being incapable of supporting a meritorious appeal. Watson was provided with a copy of her counsel's brief and notified of her right to file a pro se listing of points for reversal within thirty days. She filed no points. The State has informed this court that, because Watson failed to file any points for reversal, it does not intend to file a brief regarding her appeal.

We direct counsel's attention to Rule 4-3(j) of the Rules of the Arkansas Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, which outlines the contents of a brief to be filed in a no-merit appeal. We observe that counsel has failed to meet the rule's requirement that all adverse rulings be included in the *abstract and addendum* of his brief. Counsel has, however, otherwise complied with the rule by listing the adverse rulings in the *argument* portion of his brief and by adequately explaining why each is not a meritorious ground for appeal. Although his abstract and addendum do not contain each ruling as required by Rule 4-3(j), we find that counsel for appellant has substantially complied with the requirements of the rule; thus, it is unnecessary to order rebriefing in this case.

From our review of the record and the brief presented to us, we find compliance with Rule 4-3(j), and we hold that there is no merit to this appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the trial court's decision and grant counsel's motion to withdraw.

Affirmed; motion granted.

GLADWIN and ROBBINS, JJ., agree.